

REMARKS


In the Office Action, claims 2, 13, 14, 20, 22, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 USC section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawrence US patent 2,603,249 in view of Thoen et al US patent 3,115,739. In a subsequent Examiner interview summary record, the Examiner confirmed that claims 3-11, 21, 23, 26, 27 and 29 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, with an indication that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By this response, claim 2 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 21, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 21 has been canceled. Similarly, claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 23, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Claim 13 has been canceled. In view of the Examiner's indication, it is thus believed that claims 2 and 13 are in allowable form, along with dependent claims 3-11, 20 and 26 (which depend directly or indirectly from claim 2), and 14, 22 and 28-31 (which depend directly or indirectly from claim 13).

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place the application into condition for allowance with claims 2-11, 13, 14, 20, 22 and 26-31, and such action is earnestly requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by phone if questions remain after consideration of this response, or if such would otherwise facilitate prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew S. McConnell
Reg. No. 32,272

Boyle, Fredrickson, Newholm,
Stein & Gratz, S.C.
250 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1030
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 225-9755
Customer No.: 23598